IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.2060 OF 2005

Mr. Balu Tukaram Bhor ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.2061 OF 2005

Smt. Vatsala Vithal Londhe ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State ofMaharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 2062 OF 2005

Mr. Santosh S. Patil ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.2063 OF 2005

Mr. Dilip Hasuram Patil ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.2064 OF 2005

Smt. Rekhas Santaram Gambhir ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.2065 OF 2005

Mr. Vilas Devram Dube ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.2066 OF 2005

Mr. Prakash Kana Patil ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.2669 OF 2005

Mr. Balasaheb Chandrakant Solase ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 2670 OF 2005

Mr. Anil Prabhakar Thakur ...Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr.V.S.Deokar Adv. with Mr.L.N.Bedekar Adv. for Petitioners
Mr.Mandar Limaye Adv. for Respondents 5 & 6
Mr. Sonawane, A.G.P. for the State

CORAM: F.I.REBELLO & ROSHAN DALVI, JJ.
DATED: 18TH NOVEMBER, 2005

P.C.

1. Rule in all the Petitions. Heard forthwith.

2. The grievance of the Petitioners in all these Petitions is that though there was regular work load they have not been approved as regular teachers and subsequent to their appointment other teachers have been appointed to regular posts and approval granted for those appointments.

3. On the other hand on behalf of Respondent Management it is submitted that there is no work load and consequently the Petitioners cannot be appointed.

4. The issue will require going into facts and records of the School to resolve, the controversy. The ends of justice will be met if the Education Officer (Secondary)(ZP), Raigad Alibaug enquires into the contentions of the Petitioners and decide the same. If the Education Officer comes to the conclusion that the Petitioners were wrongly denied appointment, he to issue appropriate directions to the Management. If the Education Officer comes to the conclusion that there is no work load, then to pass appropriate orders. The decision in each of the cases individually or collectively be taken within eight weeks from today.

5. In the event the order is adverse to the Petitioner the interim order to continue for a further period of 2 weeks from the date of receipt of the final decision of the Education Officer (Secondary) Zilla Parishad, Raigad by the Petitioners.

6. Petitioner will appear before the Education Officer on 29th November 2005 at 11.00 a.m. for further directions. Needless to say that the Petitioners and the Management and other persons likely to be affected will be heard by the Officer before taking decision.

7. The Education Officer will also consider the contention of the Petitioner that they have not been

paid salaries and if that be so the Education Officer to issue orders and directions to pay the salaries to the Petitioners for the period of which they claim.

. Rule made absolute accordingly in all the Petitions. No order as to costs.

(F.I.REBELLO J.)

(ROSHAN DALVI, J.)